

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/827,141 | 04/19/2004 | Robert A. Davis | D-7557 | 2305 | |
| 7590 11/17/2005 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| Arthur G. Yeager, P.A. 245-1 East Adams Street Jacksonville, FL 32202-3336 | | | HRUSKOCI, PETER A | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | | | 1724 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

b

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/827,141 | DAVIS ET AL. | | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | | Peter A. Hruskoci | 1724 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) file | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2004 and 19 August 2005. | | | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . | 2b)⊠ This a | action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the pract | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected. | , | | | | | | | |
| • | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restrict | ction and/or e | election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority | | | N. | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | | |
| = = = and action a more details for a not of the doration depict flot received. | | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) | | | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F | | Paper No(s)/Mail Dat | e | 150 | | | | |
| Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date | PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other: | tent Application (PTO |) - 152) | | | | |

Page 2

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1, 10, and 19 "without the use ...correct dewatering" and "pDADMAC" and "ACH", and in claim 1 "existing coagulation... and others" are vague and indefinite because it is unclear how these terms further limit the claims. It is submitted that pDADMAC" and "ACH" appear to be additional flocculants or coagulants. It is unclear in claims 16-18 and 23-27 how the recitation of additional essential steps (g) and (h) further limits claims 10 and 19 respectively, since the "consisting essentially of" and "consisting of" terminology excludes additional essential steps from the claims. Claims 2-9, 11-15, and 20-22 depend from the above claims.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reyna 6,319,412 in view of Lahti 5,807,487 or Haase 6,120,690, and Sheets 6,863,826. Reyna disclose (see col. 3 line 7 through col. 6 line 40) a method of clarifying laundry wastewater substantially as claimed. The claims differ from Reyna by reciting the addition of a specific cationic blend and the dewatering of sludge in a specific press. Lahti (see col. 4 line 24 through col. 6 line 64) and Haase (see col. 1 line 9 through col. 6 line 48) disclose that it is known in the art to utilize mixtures or blends of aluminum chlorohydrate and diallyldimethylammonium chloride, to aid in clarifying wastewater. Sheets disclose (see col. 6 lines 10-29) that it is known

in the art to utilize a plate and frame filter press, to aid in dewatering wastewater sludge. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Reyna by adding the recited blend, and utilizing the recited press, in view of the teachings of Lahti or Haase, and Sheets, respectively, to aid in clarifying the wastewater and in dewatering the sludge. The specific amount of sludge generated, strength of the flocculent solution, and percentages utilized to form the blend, would have been an obvious matter of process optimization to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific wastewater clarified and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results.

Page 3

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (571) 272-1160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1166. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peter A. Hruskoci Primary Examiner Art Unit 1724

11/14/05